

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

IN RE:	:	
	:	
APPLICATION OF MCF COMMUNICATIONS	:	DOCKET NO. 345
bg, INC. AND CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A	:	
VERIZON WIRELESS FOR A CERTIFICATE	:	
OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND	:	
PUBLIC NEED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION,	:	
MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF A	:	
WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS	:	
FACILITY OFF EXETER DRIVE, STERLING,	:	
CONNECTICUT	:	NOVEMBER 19, 2007

RESPONSES OF CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS TO
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL PRE-HEARING INTERROGATORIES, SET TWO

On November 6, 2007, the Connecticut Siting Council ("Council") issued Pre-Hearing Interrogatories to the Applicants, MCF Communications bg, Inc. ("MCF") and Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless ("Cellco") (collectively, the "Applicant"), relating to the above-captioned docket. Below are the Applicant's responses.

Question No. 1

If requested by the Connecticut Siting Council (Council), could the proposed tower be designed with a yield point to ensure that the tower setback radius (i.e. fall zone) would remain within the boundaries of the subject property in the event of a tower failure? If yes, at what height on the tower (above ground level) would the yield point have to be located at?

Response

Yes. The tower can be designed with a yield point to ensure that the fall zone is within the property boundaries. The height of the "yield point" is based on several factors including the

height and diameter of the tower, foundation design, and geotechnical analysis. Much of this information will not be available until after the Council approves the cell site location and the Applicant develops its D&M Plan for the facility. The precise height of the “yield point” will be included as a part of the Council’s D&M Plan.

Question No. 2

Is Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless (Verizon Wireless) proposing a platform-mount for its antennas? If yes, alternatively, could Verizon Wireless use T-arms or flush-mounting for its proposed antennas? How would coverage and capacity be affected by T-arms or the flush-mounted configuration?

Response

Cellco’s antenna configuration includes the mounting of antennas on a low profile antenna platform. This configuration provides a stable platform for the maintenance and installation of antennas. Cellco could satisfy its coverage objectives by installing a full array of antennas on T-arms at the Sterling facility.

If Cellco were required to use flush-mount antennas, it would require the increase in antenna height of 10 feet to make up for the loss of approximately 2dB in coverage it would experience by installing flush-mounted antennas. Cellco would prefer the use of T-arm mounted antennas at the 140-foot level on the proposed tower.

Question No. 3

Which airport is closest to the proposed facility? Provide the distance and direction to the airport from the proposed facility.

Response

According to the FAA studies completed for this project, Riconn Airport is the closest airport at 2.03 nautical miles from the proposed Sterling facility. The Danielson Airport is located 7.24 nautical miles from the Sterling facility.

Question No. 4

Would the applicant be amenable to providing backup power to municipal services that might share in the use of this proposed facility?

Response

MCF, as a tower developer and facility operator, does not provide back-up power to any of its tenants including municipal tenants at its tower sites. As described in the Application, Cellco will be maintaining an on-site back-up generator. Cellco is not aware of any interest by the Town of Sterling in installing antennas on the tower or having access to back-up power. Cellco has, at other cell site locations, provided emergency service entities with access to its back-up generator.